

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-1288

LUCITA O. MATTHEWS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JOHN H. BROWN, individually and in his official capacity as Sheriff of Carroll County; CHARLES F. FOWLER, individually and in his official capacity as Chief Deputy Sheriff of Carroll County; JOHN W. STULTZ, individually and in his official capacity as Deputy Sheriff of Carroll County and in his former official capacity as Warden of Carroll County Detention Center; EARL STEVEN TURVIN, individually and in his official capacity as a Deputy Sheriff of Carroll County and in his former official capacity as Warden of the Carroll County Detention Center; MARK L. PEREGOY, individually and in his official capacity as a Deputy Sheriff of Carroll County; THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT OF CARROLL COUNTY,

Defendants - Appellees,

MARYLAND COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Benson E. Legg, District Judge. (CA-95-305-L)

Submitted: May 11, 2000

Decided: May 16, 2000

Before MURNAGHAN, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lucita O. Matthews, Appellant Pro Se. Kathy Marie Britton-Bracey, Assistant County Attorney, Towson, Maryland; Richard Timothy Colaresi, Bowie, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Lucita O. Matthews appeals the district court's orders: (1) granting her motion to reopen the case, granting the Defendants' motions to dismiss, and denying her motion for default judgment; and (2) denying her subsequent motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Matthews v. Maryland Comm'n on Human Relations, No. CA-95-305-L (D. Md. Feb. 16 & Mar. 9, 2000). We grant the Defendants' motion to strike Matthews' positive disclosure statement because we find it was improperly filed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26.1 and 4th Cir. R. 26.1. We also grant the unopposed motion to dismiss the Maryland Commission on Human Relations as a party to this lawsuit. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED